



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the children the reverse of this. You value nothing rightly till it has cost you something. Not income, but fulness of outgo and expression constitute the highest joy and success. Jesus says "it is more blessed to give than to receive." No one can ever doubt that this is a spiritual universe, after once he has bowed his head before this most mystical and actual of its laws. There is a labor price for everything of value. Suffering is the name of the cost of labor in the realm of the spirit and for all human and social values.

Of course the cost frightens us at

times. It is blood and tears and torture, and generations of time pass as it works its solemn sway. But who would dare to rule it out of the world?

No struggle—no heroism! No pain—no love! No doubt—no faith! No despair—no immortal hope! The great values come high; who cares how high they come, when once their music rings in our ears! What does the mother care for her pains, when her baby lies safe in her arms! And who minds the centuries of waiting, when the weary world at last swings into its new cycle of light!

THE MARRIAGE OF HOSEA

J. M. POWIS SMITH, PH.D.

Associate Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures,
University of Chicago

How many of the Old Testament worthies we come to understand through a knowledge of their family! The Old Testament is, indeed, a domestic literature. We know the family affairs of nearly all of its chief personages, and among them all there is no one whose family life is described quite as tragically as that of Hosea. Are his references really allegorical, or do they represent his own pathetic experiences? The question is exegetically significant, but even more does its answer enable us to appreciate the great teaching of Hosea as to the love of God.

The prevailing interpretation of the narrative portions of Hos. chaps. 1-3, is to the effect that Hosea, as a young man, fell in love with Gomer and married her, supposing her to be all that his youthful imagination fancied her to be. To this union were born three children. But meantime, Gomer had developed latent tendencies to sensuality and had played

Hosea false. At last she left his home to live with another man. The love of Hosea, however, made it impossible for him to leave her to her fate, and going after her he purchased her from her paramour and placed her under restraint, preparatory to her full restoration to her position as his wife. Long brooding over this tragic experience produced in

Hosea the conviction that it all had been ordained of Yahweh to the end that Hosea might thereby be aroused to the true significance of Israel's attitude toward Yahweh and be inspired to preach to Israel regarding her sin. The whole experience was Yahweh's way of calling Hosea to be a prophet.

The attractiveness of this interpretation lies in the essentially human and natural character of the experience thus portrayed. It presents no psychological difficulties to the modern mind. Hosea becomes a man like ourselves, moved by similar passions and learning the will of God precisely as we do by experience. Many of the leaders of modern scholarship have enthusiastically indorsed this view and furthered it by both learning and eloquence. Among others may be mentioned Cheyne, Wellhausen, W. Robertson Smith, Kuenen, George Adam Smith, A. B. Davidson, Nowack, Marti, and W. R. Harper. Yet, I venture to think that the truth lies on the side of older generations of scholars, whose exegetical sense forbade them taking the language of Hosea as meaning other than what, on the face of it, it seems to say. Modern representatives of this view, which looks upon Gomer as having been a public prostitute when Hosea married her, have not been lacking. The most forceful presentation of this interpretation in recent years is that of Professor Paul Volz, in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, XLIV (1898), 321-35. The present article proposes once more to array the evidence for a literal interpretation of the language of

Hosea and to reconstruct this section of the biography of the prophet.¹

The language of the narrative leaves no room for the view that Gomer was a woman with a tendency toward harlotry, rather than an out-and-out harlot. Much has been made in support of the tendency view, of the fact that in 1:2 Hosea is told to take a "wife of harlotries" (אִשֶּׁת זְנוּנִים), not "a harlotrous wife." But there is no chance for the idea "a wife with tendencies toward harlotry" in the former phrase. Exactly the same idiom is employed in Prov. 12:4; 31:10 and Ruth 3:11, where "a woman (or wife) of virtue" certainly does not and cannot mean "a woman with tendencies toward virtue," but simply "a virtuous woman." The same thing is true of similar phrases in Prov. 6:24; 9:13; 11:16; 21:9; 25:24; and 27:15. Hosea himself uses the same idiom again in 4:12 and 5:4, where "a spirit of harlotries" is clearly something more than "a spirit with tendencies toward harlotry." The idiom is simply one of the regular ways of predicating a characteristic of a person and cannot legitimately be made to carry such a load as the "tendency" view places upon it. Gomer the "wife of harlotries" was nothing more nor less than a "wife who plays the harlot."

Nor is it true that Hosea was made a prophet by his marriage. According to the literal sense of the narrative, the marriage itself was imposed upon him by the word of Yahweh; i.e., he was already a prophet before marriage. Even if this plain statement might be legitimately

¹ Since this article was put in type Professor C. H. Toy, of Harvard University, has published an article, "Note on Hosea 1-3," in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXII (June, 1913), 75-79, in which he also declares for a literal interpretation of the language descriptive of Gomer.

set aside on the ground that it is the product of Hosea's later reflection upon the cause and significance of his marriage, it yet remains true that Hosea was a prophet at the time of the birth of the first child. For he bestowed upon him a name having prophetic significance. Yet it is quite generally held by exponents of the "tendency" view that at this time Hosea knew nothing of his wife's unfaithfulness, which is supposed to have kindled in him the prophetic fire. Furthermore, it is not at all necessary to posit such a marital experience in explanation of the origin of Hosea's characteristic conception of the relation between Yahweh and Israel as one in which the ruling principle should be a mutual love, like that that should obtain between husband and wife. The representation of a god as the husband of his land was close at hand in the Baalism of the day, in which this was the basic thought. The thought of Yahweh's love for his people, even though they were sinful, was by no means new; it is implied in Amos 2:9-11 and 3:2 and finds clear expression in the stories of J and E incorporated in the Hexateuch; e.g., Exod. 15:13; Jos. 23:4-11; Deut. 33:12. It would have been wholly cruel to require Hosea to arrive at the idea of Yahweh's love for Israel through such a heart-breaking experience as the "tendency" view presupposes, when that idea lay ready to hand, having been worked out in the experience of preceding generations.

The "tendency" view also implies that Hosea first of all received a revelation from Yahweh through the marriage experience, which he was to pass on to the people of Israel. But there is not a word said in the narrative about this mediating function of Hosea. Judging from analagous records in which the rôle of mediator is always explicitly enjoined upon the prophet, it is not likely that this mediating task was to be taken for granted by Hosea. The brevity of the record is a most serious obstacle in the path of the "tendency" interpretation for that view implies so much that is not mentioned in the narrative. So vital an element in the experience as the revelation of Gomer's true character *after his marriage* could hardly have been passed over in utter silence.¹ Nor would there have been left unexplained such an extraordinary fact as Hosea's continuing his marital relations with a wife after the birth of two children, one of whom at least was a child of shame, if Gomer's true nature had been unknown to him before his marriage. Furthermore, such a case of adultery as is presupposed by this view was punishable by death; cf. Deut. 22:22 f.; Ezek. 16:40. Hosea could hardly have passed over in silence his reason for not having the law enforced.

Hosea was not led blindfolded by Yahweh into a marriage that was to break his heart and wreck his life. On the contrary, he married a woman of evil reputation with his eyes wide open. If

¹ Cf. the statement of Professor Toy in the article previously mentioned: "The romantic history of a man wounded in his deepest feelings through an ill-fated marriage that saddened his life and colored his thought seems to me to have no foundation in the text. If there had been passionate devotion and sorrow, there would doubtless have been some mention of it, but there is none; the narrative is a quiet statement of facts."

this seem to us a psychological impossibility, we need only recall other cases in which prophets did extraordinary things. The psychology of a prophet was not subject to the laws controlling the mental operations of ordinary men. The belief that Yahweh willed the performance of any act was enough to lead them to undertake the most unusual, yea, repugnant program. Illustrations of this absolute surrender to the will of Yahweh are furnished in Isa. 20:2 f. and Ezek. 12:9 ff. Nor are instances of similar character wanting in more recent times. Simeon Stylites spending almost half a century continuously upon the top of a column, thinking that thereby he was pleasing God, is a case in point. An act looked upon as God-ordained and recognized as such from the start is thereby lifted above all ordinary rules of procedure. The will of God transcends all other laws.

The moral problem raised by such a command from Yahweh for the modern mind would not present itself to the men of the eighth century B.C. The moral difficulty is essentially the same on either hypothesis. For Yahweh to order a prophet to marry a woman who, as Yahweh knows, will turn out a harlot is every whit as bad as for him to bid the prophet marry one who is already a harlot. But this aspect of the question would present no serious difficulty to men who were able to think of Yahweh as hardening Pharaoh's heart to the end that he might destroy him; or as stirring up David to number Israel, only to punish him for so doing; or as inspiring a body of prophets to tell Ahab a lie, in order that Ahab might go to his death.

The marriage to Gomer presented

itself to Hosea as required of him by Yahweh, precisely because it was an extraordinary and sensational act. It was calculated to attract wide-spread attention. It and the succeeding births were vivid object-lessons for the whole nation. Such a marriage inevitably would provoke questions and give Hosea an eager audience for his answers. These show that he intended that his family life should be regarded as a concrete illustration of the nature of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Just at this point, we need to guard against misinterpretation of the marriage. Its purpose was to present the existing situation in Israel from the point of view of Yahweh. It is reading into the narrative what is not there to insist that it shall represent the whole history of Israel's relation to Yahweh, and that Gomer, therefore, must have been a pure young maiden at the time of her marriage even as Israel is represented elsewhere (cf. Hos. 11:1; Ezek., chap. 16) to have been at the time when Yahweh chose her as his people. But the demands of the narrative and of the experience itself are satisfied if the marriage be looked upon as a striking portrayal of the utter lack of inner sympathy between Yahweh and Israel, and especially of the base disloyalty and ingratitude of Israel in not giving her full and undivided allegiance to Yahweh, her rightful Lord (cf. Hos. 2:5 ff.).

The name Gomer bath Diblaim itself may furnish evidence of the true character of its owner before her marriage. The meaning of the name apparently is "Gomer, daughter of fig-cakes." The real significance of the name is, on this basis, "Gomer whose person is held at a

low value." The point of view is furnished by a statement from an Arabic writer, viz.: "We used to conclude *mota*-marriages for a handful of dates and meal in the time of the prophet and Abu-bekr, until Omar forbade us such."¹ The *mota*-marriage was a temporary union between a man and woman and altogether unworthy of the name of marriage. The same phraseological usage appears in the common English idiom, found also in Latin, "not worth a fig." If this be the meaning of the name, Gomer is thereby branded as a woman who could be obtained for very low hire, not more than a couple of handfuls of figs. The phrase "lovers of raisin-cakes" in Hos. 3:1 belongs in the same general circle of ideas; for there the "other gods" are thought of as hiring the service of Israel with gifts of raisin-cakes. It is true that the word "daughter" does not occur elsewhere as indicative of price or value. But the terms "son" and "daughter" do have a much wider range of meaning in Hebrew than in English. They are used, for example, to express a person's age, viz., "Noah was a son of five hundred years, etc.," i.e., Noah was five hundred years old (Gen. 5:32; 7:6, etc.); or to denote a characteristic as "Joseph is a son of a fruitful one," i.e., Joseph is a fruitful bough (Gen. 49:22), and "a son of perverse rebelliousness" (I Sam. 20:30), and "a vineyard on a hill a son of oil," i.e., a vineyard on a very fertile hill (Isa. 5:1,) and "daughter of troops," i.e., warlike one (Mic. 5:1). This usage comes at times very close to the idea of price or value as, e.g., in "a son of

death," i.e., one deserving death (I Sam. 20:31), and "a son of smiting," i.e., one deserving a beating (Deut. 25:2). Yet lacking any exact parallel, we cannot dogmatically assert that this must be the true interpretation of Gomer's name; it remains only an attractive possibility.

It remains to consider the light shed upon the story of chap. 1 by the narrative of chap. 3. This has usually been taken as a record of Hosea's love for his wife which led him to go after her when she had deserted his bed and board and to purchase her back from her paramour. But this interpretation encounters serious difficulties. Why should the dissolute Gomer, whom Hosea by this time, according to hypothesis, knows only too well, be spoken of to him not as "thy wife" but as "a woman?" If his run-away wife were here meant, we should certainly expect a much more definite and specific description of her to her deserted husband than "a woman."

Again, why should Hosea have purchased his own wife from her paramour? Was she not already his morally and legally? Or was Hosea a weakling who dared not insist upon his rights and was willing to purchase peace at any price, even that of his own dishonor? The silence of the narrative regarding the desertion of Hosea by his wife is surprising. It is not mentioned at all, but taken for granted. Yet such a step on Gomer's part would have been too vital an element in the situation to be ignored. It would have been precisely the sort of thing of which Hosea would have made splendid use in setting forth the significance of his marriage for Israel.

¹ See Eb. Nestle, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xxiii, 346, and xxix, 234; cf. W. Baumgarten, *ibid.*, xxxiii, 78.

These difficulties with the current interpretation have been so keenly felt that some scholars have sought to avoid them all by making the woman of chap. 3 to be another than Gomer. But this device has not met with any general approval; and rightly so. For the experience that was pedagogically of value upon its first occurrence would have lost all novelty and value if repeated. Instead of wondering and questioning, Hosea's contemporaries would have been satisfied to set him down as a stark fool and would have gone about their own affairs and left him to his fate.

A suggestion recently made¹ seems to relieve the difficulty here. Chap. 3 is not the record of a later stage than chap. 1 in the marital experience of Hosea, but is rather a parallel narrative recording the initiation of the original marriage with Gomer. The record of chap. 3 is the story as told by Hosea himself in the first person; that of chap. 1 is the story as told by another. This accounts for the more specific and concrete detail of chap. 3. This calls for a new translation of 3:1 to be sure; but it is a translation that finds its justification in the usage of numerous other passages. Instead of "And Yahweh said to me, 'Again go, love, etc.,'" we must render "And Yahweh said to me again, 'Go, love, etc.'" For illustration of this position of the word "again," see Hos. 2:16, "thou wilt not call me again;" Isa. 8:5, "And Yahweh added to speak to me again;" Isa. 62:4, "It shall not be said to thee again." This "again" may imply

that Yahweh had previously urged this step upon Hosea without effect as in the case of Jonah. Or it may merely mean that the command to marry a prostitute was not the first communication between Yahweh and Hosea. In any case, this translation delivers us from the hypothesis of a second marriage and from the difficulty of finding an explanation for Hosea's purchase of his renegade wife.² On the understanding that this is Hosea's own story of the first and only marriage with Gomer, the purchase becomes at once natural. Marriage regularly involved the payment of a dowry to the bride's guardians; cf. the story of Jacob's marriages (Gen. 29:15 ff.). The low price paid for the bride, according to Hos. 3:1, accords well with the interpretation of "Gomer bath diblaim" (1:3) as "Gomer daughter of figs," which is suggested above.

On the basis of these two records of the marriage, we may perhaps reconstruct the story of Hosea's experience as follows: Hosea, a prophet already burdened with the sense of his people's sin, felt himself called upon by Yahweh to marry a lewd woman, to the end that through such a marriage he might open the eyes of Israel to the enormity of its offense in being disloyal to Yahweh, its rightful lord. In pursuance of this conviction, Hosea bought Gomer, a woman living in public shame with her paramour. But he at once placed her under restraint, denying her association with himself as well as with others, and seeking by such discipline to fit her for her position as his wife. This phase of the

¹ By C. Steuernagel, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1912), p. 605.

² Steuernagel and Toy account for "again" as an editorial gloss made to join the two narratives chronologically.

experience was interpreted for Israel as meaning that she as Yahweh's bride must be disciplined by exile before she could expect to enjoy any further favor from Yahweh. After this period of restraint for Gomer, she was taken by Hosea into his home and became the mother of three children. Each of these in succession was given a prophetic name and, like Isaiah's children, became a walking sermon to Israel just as the institution of the marriage itself had been. In this connection, it must be remembered that the names given to the children need cast no slur upon the birth of the children nor upon their character. The names carried by Isaiah's children certainly were not meant to bear any relation whatsoever to the children themselves. Hence, the names are not necessarily proof that the children of Hosea were not his own.

If, however, the names of the children and the fact that in Hos. 1:2 they are called "children of whoredom" i.e., children of harlotrous parentage, should seem to some to imply that Gomer was unfaithful to Hosea after her marriage, it is equally possible to suppose that Hosea took Gomer into the full rights of wifehood immediately upon marrying her. In that case, the birth of the children, who were of doubtful parentage, and the names bestowed upon them did but impress upon the public mind more deeply the lesson of the marriage itself. Then after exhausting every means, supposably, to keep Gomer in the path of virtue, Hosea put her in isolation; and there the story leaves her, to preach her silent sermon.

If it be objected to this interpretation that Hosea could not have loved a

woman of such a type, it is sufficient to say that he is not anywhere said to have loved her. The nearest approach to such a statement is 3:1, where Yahweh bids him "go, love a woman, etc." But it is worthy of note that in the very same sentence the same word "love" (אהב) is used to designate the relationship between the woman in question and her paramour. The word frequently is used to denote mere carnal passion (e.g., II Sam. 13:1, 4, 15; I Kings 11:1, 2), having no suggestion of genuine spiritual love. The fact is that early Hebrew had no word strictly corresponding to "marry" and in issuing a command to marry, it was necessary to use some descriptive phrase, such as "take a woman" (Hos. 1:2), or "become a daughter's husband" (Deut. 7:3), or "love a woman." Love is not subject to orders, and even a prophet could not command his feelings to the extent of loving in the true sense when Yahweh told him to love. Yahweh's command was really nothing more than "Go, marry a woman." Nor was it necessary that true love on Hosea's part should enter into the marriage at all. The lesson of the marriage for Israel was not dependent upon any deep feeling toward Gomer on Hosea's side. The essential thing was that Hosea had taken Gomer under his roof and had thereby become responsible for her support and likewise entitled to her undivided loyalty. Lacking this on her part, the marriage must be suspended, or broken off, until such time as she is found to be worthy of restoration. In like manner, Yahweh had taken Israel from among the nations to be his own people. He had showered prosperity upon her and given her every

reason to remain true and faithful to him. She, however, had taken up the worship of other gods and was thus, at least, sharing her devotion between Yahweh and them. This state of affairs could not continue indefinitely; Yahweh would not endure it. Its only possible outcome is exile and captivity.

To take this view of Hosea's marriage is not to make Hosea less of a prophet, but more. He is seen to be a man whose whole life, even in its most intimate relationships, was held subject to the control of Yahweh. He seeks every possible way to impress the message of

Yahweh upon Israel and does not hesitate to forego the possibility of a happy home life—yea, even to doom himself to a miserable existence, if thereby he can the more effectively deliver his message. In this respect he recalls the experience of Jeremiah who deliberately denied himself the joys of home life for a similar reason, and Ezekiel who forbade himself the natural expression of his grief when his heart was broken by the death of his wife. Hosea thus becomes one more illustration of the strength of the passion of self-sacrifice exercised in behalf of patriotism and religion.

BETHSHEMESH AND THE RECENT EXCAVATIONS OF THE PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND

DR. E. W. G. MASTERMAN

Honorary General Secretary for Palestine, Palestine Exploration Fund,
Jerusalem

When the Palestine Exploration Fund, in 1909, at length completed their five years' thorough excavation of the site of ancient Gezer—the full results of which have just been published¹—the committee lost no time in looking about for a suitable site for their next campaign. At their annual meeting in June, 1910, it was announced by the chairman, Sir Charles Watson, that the committee, largely guided by the advice of Professor R. A. S. Macalister, had selected as their new scene of work the *tell* which for many years has been considered to

mark the site of Bethshemesh. Several unforeseen difficulties, chiefly connected with the appointment of the Turkish "Commissioner," delayed the commencement, but in the spring of 1911 the work was started and, except for interruption due to the illness of the director of excavations, Dr. Mackenzie, has continued until the end of July this year. Dr. Duncan Mackenzie, Ph.D., worked for about ten years as assistant to Sir Arthur Evans in his famous excavations in Crete and has also done good work in Sardinia; he is assisted by Mr. Newton,

¹ R. A. Stewart Macalister, *Excavation of Gezer*, 3 vols.